REMARKS

Claims 1-41 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Official Action dated October 23, 2003, claim 32 was allowed and claims 1-31 and 33-41 were rejected. Applicant thanks Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Applicant herein adds new claims 42-51. Based on the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC § 112, Paragraph 1

In the 2nd paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 2, 5, 11, 14, 21, 31, and 33 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement based on the recitation of "a code generating event." Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

With respect to claim 33, Applicant respectfully notes that there is no recitation of "a code generating event" element in that claim and requests withdrawal of the rejection. With respect to claims 2, 5, 11, 14, 21, and 31, applicant respectfully submits that "a code generating event" as included in these claims is fully described throughout the specification. For example, at page 16, a code generating event is described as follows:

> The code generating event that triggers the generation of random identifier code 425 can be any one of a number of events, or a combination of events. For example, a primary event can trigger or start the initial process of generating random identifier code 425. A secondary event can then, for example, trigger the reading of an output value of a circuit, chip or electronic device.
>
> ...
>
> A primary code generating event such as power up (or other primary code generating event) can be used to initiate the process.

Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would also understand the plain meaning of the words used in the claims. For example, a "code generating event" can be understood as something that happens or takes place, a phenomenon, or occurrence that brings into existence, originates, or is the cause of a code, i.e., a random identifier code. (See, e.g., Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary, 10th Edition, or The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language).

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 5, 11, 14, 21, and 31 meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Moreover, Applicant makes note that claim 33 appears to be improperly rejected on the grounds set forth. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection to all of these claims, and withdraw it

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

In the 4th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 19-21, 23, 29-31, 33-38, and 40 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,754,268 to Mori ("Mori") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,781,458 to Gilley ("Gilley"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites:

> A wireless communications system comprising:
> a transmitter circuit for transmitting information and generating a random identifier code having randomness that is derived from tolerances associated with components included in the transmitter circuit, wherein the random identifier code is included in the transmitted information.

Similarly, claim 19 recites:

> A method for distinguishing transmissions of a wireless transmitter, the method comprising:

generating a random identifier code having randomness that is derived from tolerances associated with components included in the wireless transmitter; and
embedding the random identifier code in the transmissions of the wireless transmitter.

Claim 29 recites in part:

> A computer-readable medium having instructions stored thereon which, when executed by a processor included in a wireless communications system, cause the processor to perform the steps of:
> ...
> generating a random identifier code based on the received data; and
> storing the random identifier code in a storage area included in the wireless communications system.

Claim 36 recites:

> A method for associating a transmitter with a receiver, wherein the transmitter and the receiver are part of a wireless communications system, the method comprising:
> generating a random identifier code having randomness that is derived from tolerances associated with components included in the wireless communications system; and
> assigning the random identifier code to the transmitter and the receiver thereby creating a transmitter-receiver pair.

Independent claims 33, 34, 38, and 40 also include similar elements. The "random identifier code having randomness derived from tolerances associated with components" that is "included" or "embedded" in the transmissions or transmitted information, is stored, or is assigned to transmitter and receiver creating a transmitter-receiver pair as recited in claims 1, 19, 29, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 40 beneficially provides the advantageous ability to uniquely identify the output signals of a transmitter when they are communicated to external entities, for example, receivers in a wireless communications system, even when the electrical circuits in the transmitters are substantially similar. At the same time, costs of manufacturing transmitters can be reduced because, since the random identifier code can be internally generated based on

transmitter circuit components, static memory components to store factory predefined keys or identifying codes can be eliminated.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Mori suggests a method that based on the use of unique FM radio frequencies allows "a plurality of mouses [sic] ... to operate simultaneously at close positions without adversely affecting each other" (col. 4, lines8-10). According to Mori, a switch is used to set a value in the programmable counter thereby pre-tuning transmitter-receiver pairs to a same frequency of a set of available frequencies (while presumably other transmitter-receiver pairs can operate at other of the available frequencies "without adversely affecting each other"). In general terms, Mori discloses a wireless mouse apparatus that contains a transmitter circuitry. (Fig. 1 and col. 3, line 35). The transmitter circuitry of Mori is described as follows:

> The transmitter circuitry 10 comprises a phase locked loop type FM transmitter comprising a phase locked loop oscillator 30. The phase locked loop oscillator 30 comprises a phase-comparator 32, a low pass filter 34, a voltage controlled oscillator 36 and a programmable counter 38. The programmable controller operates as a frequency divider, and the division factor is determined by a first switch 40.
>
> A voltage controlled oscillator output signal f_o, generated by the voltage controlled oscillator 36 is input to the programmable counter 38 and utilized as a feedback signal. The programmable counter 38 divides the frequency of the voltage controlled oscillator output signal f_o. The output of the programmable counter 38 is coupled to the input of the phase-comparator 32. The phase locked loop oscillator 30 operates in a conventional manner and the programmable counter 38 controls the frequency of the voltage controlled oscillator output signal f_o. The programmable counter 38 is provided to vary the carrier frequency of the transmitted FM signal so that a plurality of mouses [sic] can operate simultaneously at close positions without adversely affecting each other.

(col. 3, line 56 to col. 4, line 10). Mori further describes a receiver coupled to a host computer that comprises receiver circuitry, including a programmable counter 60. (See Fig. 2 and col. 4, lines 32-45). Further, describing the system's operation, Mori shows the following:

> For the reception of the radio wave signal R transmitted by the mouse 9, the receiver 12 is tuned to the same carrier frequency as the radio wave signal R. Hence, the first programmable counter 38 and the second programmable counter 60 are set to the same value

(col. 4, lines 45-50).

Mori fails to disclose the process by which the first programmable counter 38 and the second programmable counter 60 are "set to the same value." However, as shown above, Mori teaches that "the programmable controller operates as a frequency divider, and the division factor is determined by a first switch 40." A switch is "a device for making, breaking, or changing the connections in an electric circuit." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms, Fifth Edition, 1993. For example, a simple switch could be a two state switch (on/off). By setting the switch to "on" or "off," a different value would be programmed in the programmable counter 38 of transmitter in Mori. For two devices to communicate wirelessly, they must be tunned to the same frequency at the time the communication takes place. That is, a transmitter and a receiver must be operating in the same frequency. Thus, it is critical to have the same value in the programmable counter so that the same frequency is synthesized in the synthesizer. For example, the receiver and transmitter switches disclosed in Mori could be set to "on" at the factory thereby setting both programmable counters to the same value and enabling the RF communication on the same frequency between a mouse and a receiver coupled to the host computer. Other transmitter-receiver pairs could be set to "off" so that "a plurality of

mouses [sic] can operate simultaneously at close positions without adversely affecting each other."

Further, Mori does not describe or suggest the use of "an identifier code" in place of or in conjunction with the disclosed switch 40. Further, Mori does not describe or suggest an "identifier code [that] is included in the transmitted information." Any reading of Mori as showing or suggesting transmitting an "identifier code" so that both programmable counters "are set to the same value" would make the system in Mori inoperable. That is, the receiver in Mori would not be able to receive anything from the transmitter, including an identifier code, unless both receiver and transmitter are tuned to the same frequency. In order to be tuned to the same frequency, the programmable counters must be set to the same value. Therefore, the same value is set on the programmable counters before anything can be transmitted. Thus, contrary to Examiner's observations, Applicant respectfully submits that Mori does not teach, or suggest that an "identifier code" is included in the transmitted information "for the purpose of identifying the transmission among a plurality of similar transmissions." (Official Action, p.3). The method to "identify transmissions among a plurality of similar transmissions" described in Mori is based on frequency diversity, for example, by pre-tuning receiver-transmitter pairs to the same frequency using a switch to set a common value in the programmable counters, as opposed to, by including an identifier code in the transmitted information as claimed in the present invention.

In addition, Gilley also fails to disclose or suggest these elements of the claims that are not shown or suggested in Mori. Gilley describes a method and apparatus for generating truly random numbers derived from the instability of an RC oscillator. (See col. 2, lines 12-17). The system of Gilley provides a generator that produces with a high degree of probability a different sequence of numbers every time it is used. (See col. 1, lines 33-34 and col. 2, lines 9-11). This

is possible because the randomness is derived from "fluctuations in the frequency of the oscillator" which take place over time. (See col. 4, line 35 and col. 5, lines 6-8).

In contrast, the "random identifier code" according to the present invention is based on a "randomness that is derived from tolerances associated with components." This random identifier code is different from the random number of Gilley because "the signal data produced by any one circuit having a set of tolerances may be consistent and predictable given a consistent and predictable input stimulus is applied to that circuit. However, this predictability is unique to the particular circuit." Thus, a "random identifier code" may be unique to a particular circuit, as opposed to other similarly designed and manufactured circuits, but unlike the system of Gilley, it may not change significantly over time because it is based on component tolerances and not oscillator frequency fluctuations. Hence, for example, a particular transmitter can be identified from among other similar transmitters by a random identifier code according to the present invention, and the random identifier code would remain substantially the same over time even if it is regenerated. Therefore, Gilley fails to show the random identifier code based on a "randomness that is derived from tolerances associated with components" as recited in claims 1, 19, 29, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 40.

different code each time?

Further, assuming arguendo that Mori suggests the use of an identifier code, there would be no motivation to combine that reference with the random number generation technique shown in Gilley because the same mouse would produce a different code every time which no longer would identify the mouse, i.e., the programmable counter would not be set to the same value which would vary the communication frequency and thereby break the link between transmitter and receiver.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claims 1, 19, 29, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 40 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Additionally, claims 2, 5, 9, 20-21, 23, 30, 31, 35, and 37 are directly or indirectly dependent on one of claims 1, 19, 29, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 40. As such, all arguments advanced above with respect to claims 1, 19, 29, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 40 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 2, 5, 9, 20-21, 23, 30, 31, 35, and 37. Based on these arguments, Mori fails to disclose at least the "random identifier code having randomness derived from tolerances associated with components" that is "included" or "embedded" in the transmissions or transmitted information, is stored, or is assigned to transmitter and receiver creating a transmitter-receiver pair as claimed in claims 1, 19, 29, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 40. In addition, the Gilley reference, even if it was properly combined, also fails to suggest at least this element missing in Mori.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claims 2, 5, 9, 20-21, 23, 30, 31, 35, and 37 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

In the 5th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 3,4,7,8, and 22 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mori in view of Gilley, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,515,540 to Grider et al. ("Grider"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, and 22 are directly or indirectly dependent on one of claims 1 or 19. As such, all arguments advanced above with respect to claims 1 and 19 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 3, 4, 7, 8, and 22. Based on these arguments, Mori fails to disclose at least the "random identifier code having randomness derived from tolerances associated with components" that is "included" or "embedded" in the transmissions or transmitted information as claimed in claims 1 and 19. In addition, the Gilley reference, even if it was properly combined with the Mori reference, also fails to suggest at least this element missing in Mori.

Grider discloses a microcontroller with improved security against tampering. (Abstract). "When encryption is enabled by loading the encryption key registers with a 40-bit key, the DS5000FP will encrypt both data and addresses using this key value as a seed." (col. 8, lines18-22). "The encryption algorithm uses an internally stored and protected key. Any attempt to discover the key value results in its erasure rendering the encrypted contents of the RAM useless." (col. 23, lines 25-28). However, Grider also fails to disclose the "random identifier code having randomness derived from tolerances associated with components" that is "included" or "embedded" in the transmissions or transmitted information as claimed in claims 1 and 19.

Therefore, each of the references cited, Grider, Mori, and Gilley, fails to anticipate at least this element of claims 1 and 19. Further, even if these references could be properly combined, their combination still fails to anticipate at least this one element of the claimed invention of claims 3, 4, 7, 8, and 22. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claims 3, 4, 7, 8, and 22 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

In the 6th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claim 6 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mori in view of Gilley, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 3,659,853 to Church ("Church"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 is dependent on claim 5, which depends on claim 1. As such, all arguments advanced above with respect to claims 1 and 5 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claim 6. Based on these arguments, Mori fails to disclose at least the "random identifier code having randomness derived from tolerances associated with components" that is "included in the transmissions or transmitted information" as recited in claim 1. In addition, the Gilley reference, even if it was properly combined with the Mori reference, also fails to suggest at least this element missing in Mori.

Church discloses an electronic dice game with "two banks of seven electric lamps ... connected in logic circuitry which when operated randomly illuminates the lamps in such a manner as to simulate, with equal probability, the six sides of a die." (Abstract). "The circuit for the light banks includes a six-stage cathode-coupled ring counter consisting of 6 silicon controlled rectifiers Q1-Q6." (col. 2, lines 16-18; *emphasis added*). "The lamps 1-7 are connected across the battery 26 in various combinations sequentially through on of the silicon controlled rectifiers Q1-Q6 ... The particular light combination is determined by that silicon controlled rectifier Q1-Q6 which is in a state of conduction." (col. 2, lines 31-36). That is, the ring counter (i.e., the 6 silicon controlled rectifiers) controls the sequential combination of lights. Further, the ring counter sequences between the state of conduction of each rectifier as long as a shift pulse signal is generated by oscillators 14 and 16. The oscillators 14 and 16 begin to oscillate and generate the shift pulse signal when the push-button operating switch 28 is depressed. (See col. 1, line 71 through col. 2, line 5 and col. 2, line 57- col. 3, line 21). "The

randomness results from the fact that the timing cycle is too fast for human reaction and therefore any slight variation in the length of time of the [push-button] operating switch 28 is maintained depressed results in a random selection of a particular group of lamps in each bank." (col. 2, lines 11-15). Hence, the output of the ring-counter in Church is not a random identifier code but simply a lamp combination that depends on how long a push-button is depressed.

Further, Church also fails to disclose the "random identifier code having randomness derived from tolerances associated with components that is included in the transmitted information" as recited in claim 1. As previously shown, the randomness in Church depends on "the length of time of the operating switch 28 is maintained depressed."

Therefore, each of the references cited, Church, Mori, and Gilley, fails to anticipate at least this element of claim 1. Further, even if these references could be properly combined, their combination still fails to anticipate at least this one element of the claimed invention of claim 6. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claim 6 is also patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

In the 7th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 10, 11, 14, 17, 24-26, 28, 39, and 41 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,280,327 to Leifer et al. ("Leifer") in view of Gilley. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 recites:

> A wireless communications system comprising:
> a transceiver circuit for transmitting and receiving information, and for generating a random identifier code having randomness that is derived from tolerances associated with components included in the transceiver circuit, wherein the random identifier code is included in the transmitted information.

Similarly, claim 24 recites:

> A method for distinguishing transmissions of a transceiver included in a wireless communications system, the method comprising:
>
> generating a random identifier code having randomness that is derived from tolerances associated with components included in the transceiver; and
>
> embedding the random identifier code in the transmissions of the transceiver.

Claim 39 recites:

> A wireless communications system comprising:
>
> a transceiver circuit means for transmitting and receiving information, and for generating a random identifier code having randomness that is derived from tolerances associated with components included in the transceiver circuit means, wherein the random identifier code is included in the transmitted information.

And claim 41 similarly recites:

> A method for distinguishing transmissions of a transceiver means included in a wireless communications system, the method comprising:
>
> generating a random identifier code having randomness that is derived from tolerances associated with components included in the transceiver means; and
>
> embedding the random identifier code in the transmissions of the transceiver means.

The "random identifier code having randomness derived from tolerances associated with components" that is "included" or "embedded" in the transmissions or transmitted information as recited in claims 10, 24, 39, and 41 beneficially provide the advantageous ability to uniquely identify the output signals of a transceiver when they are communicated to external entities, for example, receivers or other transceivers in a wireless communications system, even when the electrical circuits in the sending transceivers are substantially similar. At the same time, costs of manufacturing transceivers can be reduced because, since the random identifier code can be

internally generated based on the transceiver circuit components, static memory components to store factory predefined keys or identifying codes can be eliminated.

Leifer describes "a wireless control unit [that] includes a controller having at least one user operable switch and wireless transmitter circuitry for transmitting game information." (Abstract). "For bi-directional wireless communication, the controller 20 and the console interface 50 both would include the transmitter logic 42 ... and the receiver logic 70." (col. 7, lines 5-8). However, unlike the claimed invention, the Leifer reference describes that

> [f]or multiple player applications, a plurality of controllers 20 and either a single console interface 50 having receiver circuitry 70 to receive game information from the plurality of controllers (FIG. 9), or a plurality of console interfaces in one to one correspondence with the plurality of controllers (FIG. 10) are used. In either configuration, the game information transmitted from a controller 20 to its corresponding receiver circuitry 70 is differentiated from game information transmitted from other controllers 20 to their corresponding receiver circuitry 70 so as to avoid cross-talk between the controllers. To achieve this, the controller 20 and console interface 50 for each player may be configured to transmit and received the bit streams at the same frequency band but the frequency band for each controller and corresponding receiver circuitry is different. Alternatively, each controller may transmit the game information at the same frequency but the data coding scheme used by each controller and corresponding receiver circuitry is different. To select the operational frequency band or data coding scheme for the controller 20 and corresponding receiver circuitry 70 for each player, player select switches are provided.

(col. 6, lines 2-21; *emphasis added*). The use of different frequencies for each transmitter and its corresponding receiver circuitry to avoid cross-talk between multiple transmitters and receivers is well known in the art and, as discussed above with respect to Mori, frequency variation is distinct from the "random identifier code" technique of the invention as claimed by Applicant.

In addition, the use of different "data coding schemes" for each transmitter and its corresponding receiver circuitry described in Leifer to avoid cross-talk is also distinct from the "random identifier code" technique of the claimed invention as recited in claims 10, 24, 39 and 41. Leifer does not further describe how the use of different "data coding schemes" avoids cross-talk. However, as known in the art, a "coding scheme" is "a set of rules used to convert data from one from of representation to another." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms, Fifth Edition, 1993. In wireless communications, the set of rules to convert data from a baseband signal to a radio frequency signal are given by the modulation technique used. For example, Pulse-code modulation (PCM), Pulse-width modulation (PWM), Pulse-amplitude modulation (PAM), Pulse-position modulation (PPM), Frequency-shift keying (FSK), Phase-shift keying (PSK) or the like. Only systems using the same modulation scheme can communicate with one another. Therefore, although not disclosed, the Leifer system probably avoids cross-talk in the multi-player environment by selecting a common data coding scheme or modulation scheme for the controller 20 and corresponding receiver circuitry 70 for each player with the switches provided, not by embedding or including an identifier code in the game information.

Conversely, multiple transmitters and receivers (or transceivers) according to the claimed invention can communicate with each other without changing any frequency or modulation scheme. This enables the transmission of the "random identifier code" that is included or embedded in the transmission or transmitted information. For example, once the random identifier code is received by the intended receiver (or transceiver), other information transmitted from other transmitters or transceivers can still be received. However, because the random identifier code is included or embedded in the information transmitted, that information can be

discarded if it fails to include the appropriate random identifier code. Thus, the transmitters and receivers (or transceivers) according to the present invention can properly operate even if they all transmit in the same frequency using the same coding scheme or modulation.

Hence, in addition to not disclosing "an identifier code having randomness that is derived from tolerances associated with components included in the transmitter circuit" as noted by Examiner, Leifer also fails to show an "identifier code" that is "included" or "embedded" in the transmissions or transmitted information as recited in claims 10, 24, 39, and 41.

Additionally, as discussed above, Gilley describes a method and apparatus for generating truly random numbers derived from the instability of an RC oscillator that is distinct from the "random identifier code having randomness that is derived from tolerances associated with components included in the transceiver circuit" as claimed by Applicant.

Further, assuming *arguendo* that Leifer suggests the use of an identifier code as part of the data-coding scheme, there would be no motivation to combine that reference with the random number generation technique shown in Gilley because it would make the system in Leifer inoperable. That is, if each time a user sets a different random coding scheme based on Gilley's random code generation with the switch in Leifer, it would produce a different random coding scheme for the transmitter and a different random coding scheme for the receiver, thereby disabling their communication. None of the references cited shows a method or technique to set both the transmitter in the controller and the receiver in the console interface to a common data coding scheme other than by the use of a switch. Presumably, each switch position corresponds to a pre-set (not random) coding scheme so that if the transmitter's switch is set to a first position and the receiver's switch is set to the same first position, both transmitter and receiver predictably operate according to the same data-coding scheme. However, if as Examiner

suggests, the coding scheme of Leifer is set to a random coding scheme based on Gilley's randomness disclosure, either with a switch or without a switch, it would make the game controller system of Leifer inoperable because the transmitter in the controller would be randomly set to one coding scheme that will likely be different from the random coding scheme in the receiver of the console interface, that is, the controller would not be able to communicate with the console.

Additionally, in support of the combination of references, Examiner contends that "a person in the art would be motivated to combine the cited references because "because [the random identifier code circuit of Gilley] provides a very robust identifier code for distinguishing transmissions between a plurality of similar transmissions without the use of select switches." In order to support a rejection under 35 USC § 103, however, the Examiner must provide "some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references." In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1074, 5 USPQ 2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The Examiner has not cited an objective prior art reference that provides an incentive, motivation, or suggestion for making the suggested combination. Also, Examiner has not established by objective evidence that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead one to make the suggested combination. In particular, none of the cited references teach or suggest a motivation to convert the switch based cross-talk avoidance technique for the gaming system of Leifer to a random identifier code based system that operates "without the use of select switches." In fact, as shown above the Mori reference also cited by Examiner similarly uses a switch to tune transmitters and receivers to the same frequency. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the suggested combination is improper.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claims 10, 24, 39, and 41 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Additionally, claims 11, 14, 17, 25, 26, and 28 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 10 or 24. As such, all arguments advanced above with respect to claims 10 and 24 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 11, 14, 17, 25, 26, and 28. Based on these arguments, Leifer fails to disclose at least the "random identifier code having randomness derived from tolerances associated with components" that is "included" or "embedded" in the transmission or transmitted information as claimed by Applicant. In addition, the Gilley reference, even if it was properly combined, also fails to suggest at least this element missing in Leifer.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claims 11, 14, 17, 25, 26, and 28 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

In the 8th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 12, 13, 16, 17, and 27 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Leifer in view of Gilley, and in further view of Grider. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 12, 13, 16, 17, and 27 are also directly or indirectly dependent on claim 10 or 24. As such, all arguments advanced above with respect to claims 10 and 24 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 12, 13, 16, 17, and 27.

Based on these arguments, Leifer fails to disclose at least the "random identifier code having randomness derived from tolerances associated with components" that is "included" or "embedded" in the transmission or transmitted information as claimed by Applicant in claims 10 and 24.

In addition, the truly random number generation of Gilley, even if it was properly combined, also fails to suggest at least this element missing in Leifer.

Further, the additional combination of the tampering proof microcontroller of Grider also fails to disclose at least the element of claims 10 and 24 missing in Leifer and Gilley.

Therefore, each of the references cited, Leifer, Gilley, and Grider, fails to anticipate at least the "random identifier code having randomness derived from tolerances associated with components" that is "included" or "embedded" in the transmission or transmitted information as claimed by Applicant in claims 12, 13, 16, 17, and 27. Further, even if these references could be properly combined, their combination still fails to anticipate at least this element of Applicant's claimed invention as recited in claims 12, 13, 16, 17, and 27. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claims 12, 13, 16, 17, and 27 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

In the 9th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claim 15 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Leifer in view of Gilley, and in further view of Church. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 is dependent on claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, which in turn is dependent on claim10. As such, all arguments advanced above with respect to claims 10, 12 and 14 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claim 15.

Based on these arguments, Leifer fails to disclose at least the "random identifier code having randomness derived from tolerances associated with components" that is "included in the transmitted information" as claimed by Applicant in claim 10.

In addition, the truly random number generation of Gilley, even if it was properly combined, also fails to suggest at least this element missing in Leifer.

Further, the additional combination of the ring-counter in the electronic dice game of Church also fails to disclose at least the element of claim 10 missing in Leifer and Gilley.

Therefore, each of the references cited, Leifer, Gilley, and Church, fails to anticipate at least the "random identifier code having randomness derived from tolerances associated with components" that is "included in the transmitted information" as claimed by Applicant in claim 15. Further, even if these references could be properly combined, their combination still fails to anticipate at least this element of Applicant's claimed invention as recited in claim 15. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claim 15 is also patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

CONCLUSION

In sum, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-51, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference both alone and in combination and including references cited, but not applied. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of these claims.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
PIERRE H. CHÊNES

Date: January 22, 2004 By: _____

Hector J. Ribera, Esq.
Registration No. 54,397
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7192
Fax: (650) 938-5200